1876MNRAS..36..292F

No. in Catalogue.	Name of Star.	No. in Catalogue.	Name of Star.
7101	Σ (1971)	8510	Σ (2457)
7102	Σ (1972)	8531	γ Cygni
7103	Σ (1973)	8728	α Cygni
7143	Σ (1993)	8771	Σ (2522)
7155	Σ (1998)	8782	η Cephei
7186	Σ (2010)	8875	Σ (2544)
7219	θ Herculis	8892	62 ξ Cygni
7221	ξ Draconis	8973	Σ (2578)
7240	γ Draconis	8982	77 Draconis
7261	Σ (2039)	9028	α Cephei
7330	Σ (2064)	9051	Σ (2596)
7440	Σ (2103)	9259	Σ (2634)
7449	χ Draconis	9385	α Aquarii
7469	δ Ursæ Min.	9412	Σ (2668)
7474	Σ (2114)	9445	Σ (2675)
7560	Σ (2147)	9458	ζ Cephei
7690	γ Lyræ	9487	Σ (2691)
7692	Σ (2201)	9513	Σ (2699)
7722	Σ (2213)	9556	3 Lacertæ
7770	Σ (2239)	9616	7 Lacertæ
7779	Σ (2242)	9618	Σ (2728)
7879	δ Draconis	9713	Σ (2747)
7961	π Draconis	9736	Err. of $2^{\text{m}} = 9723$
7979	α Vulpeculæ	9745	Σ (2754)
8048	Σ (2326)	9777	ι Cephei
8109	Σ (2342)	9878	α Pegasi
8135	γ Aquilæ	9906	Σ (2787)
8312	Σ (2403)	9910	Σ (2789)
8379	Σ (2420)	10083	Σ (2830)
8422	Piazzi xx. 38	10116	λ Andromedæ

Note on the Two Exterior Satellites of Uranus.

By the Rev. T. W. Webb.

The admitted extreme faintness of even the brighter satellites of *Uranus*, the discouraging opinion of Sir John Herschel, and the utter hopelessness of Admiral Smyth as to grasping what he calls these "terrible objects to attack," may well account for the little attention which they have commonly received. It seems to have been reserved for the present favourable opposition of

Downloaded from http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/ at Oakland University on May 31, 2015

© Royal Astronomical Society • Provided by the NASA Astrophysics Data System

1876MNRAS..36..292F

the planet, to displace this idea of extreme difficulty from its long-established possession, and to show that these bodies, minute as they are, may be within the reach of the optical means, not only of our principal Observatories, but of a large porportion of amateurs. This fact appears to have been sufficiently established by Mr. Isaac William Ward, of Belfast, an accurate and persevering observer of considerable experience, whose success in the detection of many very minute *comites* vouches at once for the keenness of his vision and the excellence of his object-glass, which is one of Wray's, with an aperture of 4·3 inches. And I beg permission of the Society to lay before them the evidence which Mr. Ward has placed at my disposal, and which he has drawn up in a tabular form. The first observation, as he has remarked, is of course not connected with any satellite. The rest were mere glimpses, as may be supposed, obtained by most intense gazing, and with averted vision only.

The value and interest of these observations arise from the circumstance that in every instance the estimations were made quite independently, without previous reference to any Ephemeris; in fact, with regard to those in February and March, Mr. Ward had not at the time any tables in his possession. There is, of course, a possibility that the presence of very minute stars may have been a source of illusion, as it undoubtedly was with regard to other supposed satellites in the case of Sir W. Herschel; but considering the number of coincidences, the fair degree of approximation, the similarity of aspect in each instance, and the motion of the planet, it may perhaps be conceded that the balance of probability inclines strongly in Mr. Ward's favour.

I may be allowed to add, that, stimulated by Mr. Ward's information, and encouraged by the opinion of another experienced observer, I turned my beautiful 9·38-inch silvered glass "With" speculum to *Uranus* on the night of March 24, one of the very few favourable ones during the present season. With considerable difficulty, but without adopting indirect vision, I had occasional glimpses with a power of 212 of a very minute point in the *n f* quadrant, which, though of the most evanescent character, always when visible occupied the same position: and this was entirely confirmed by a power of 450. The next morning I found from the Ephemeris of Mr. Marth, to whom my especial thanks, and not mine alone, are due, that my very rough guess of a position-angle of about 30°, obtained merely from the motion of the planet or swinging the tube, might have either indicated *Titania* at 44° or *Oberon* at 23°. I noted the distance less carefully, and, from recollection only, supposed it might have been about 30″. *Titania* was then 24″, *Oberon* 41″. If I saw either, it was probably the former, as *Oberon* would have been less likely to be noticed near the edge of the very contracted fields I employed. Such an observation, standing singly, is of course worthless, and I have had no opportunity of repeating it; it is only in connexion with those of Mr. Ward that I could venture to mention it at all.

Downloaded from http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/ at Oakland University on May 31, 2015

© Royal Astronomical Society • Provided by the NASA Astrophysics Data System